

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Application

Claims 18 and 20-37 are pending in this application. In the July 21, 2010 final office action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 18, 23-28, 30, 31, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033430 to Lau et al. (“Lau”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174203 to Kuhn et al. (“Kuhn”);

B. Rejected claims 20, 32 and 37 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Kuhn in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,883,079 to Priborsky et al. (“Priborsky”);

C. Rejected claims 21 and 33 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) being unpatentable over Lau in view of Kuhn and in view of US 6,026,198 to Okada et al. (“Okada”);

D. Rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Kuhn in further view of US 6,094,431 to Yamato et al. (“Yamato”); and

E. Rejected claims 22 and 34 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Kuhn and in view of US Pub 2003/0222996 to Patej et al. (“Patej”).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

### II. The Obviousness Rejection of Independent Claims 18, 30, and 36

Claims 18, 30, and 36 were each rejected as being obvious over Lau in view of Kuhn. Each of claims 18, 30, and 36, however, includes the limitation “wherein each entry of the

routing table comprises a compressed forwarding address and an output link number, and that, if a positive comparison between the compressed destination address identifier and a compressed forwarding address in an entry stored in the routing table is found, the data packet is switched to an output link associated with the output link number in the entry.” As explained below, the combination of Lau and Kuhn fails to arrive at such limitations.

In the Final Office Action, Lau was cited as disclosing all of the features of claims 18, 30, and 36 except for the limitation “wherein each entry of the routing table comprises a compressed forwarding address and an output link number, and that, if a positive comparison between the compressed destination address identifier and a compressed forwarding address in an entry stored in the routing table is found, the data packet is switched to an output link associated with the output link number in the entry.” To provide this teaching, the Examiner cited Kuhn. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious for the skilled person to modify the teachings of Lau to include routing entries as taught by Kuhn, thereby arriving at the claimed invention. In this respect, the Examiner refers to paragraph [0014] of Kuhn, according to which an entry of a routing table comprises a value pair formed of a first context identifier (CID1) and an input link number, and an associated value pair formed of a second context identifier (CID2) and an output link number. The corresponding structure of the routing table is illustrated in Fig. 2.

However, as compared to the definitions of the independent claims, Kuhn does not teach a comparison between a compressed destination address identifier, which has been obtained by extracting a destination address identifier from the data packet to be forwarded and compressing the extracted destination address identifier, with a compressed forwarding

address in the entry of the routing table. According to paragraph [0014] of Kuhn, the CID1 is transmitted together with the second IP packet and then used for searching the value pair comprising input link and CID1 of the second IP packet, without decompression, routing and recompression. Accordingly, the routing method as described by Kuhn is significantly different from that as defined in the independent claims of the present application. In Kuhn, a different search process is used as the basis for switching the data packet to an output link.

Moreover, there would have been absolutely no reason to combine the teachings of Lau with those of Kuhn. As discussed in the Office Action Response filed May 24, 2010, the teachings of Lau are not concerned with routing at all. Rather, the teachings of Lau refer to the field of identifying an IP flow. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Lau as teaching a method of routing of data packets, a comparison with forwarding addresses available for routing, and entries of a routing table. Lau merely describes source addresses and destination addresses, but no forwarding addresses for routing. Also, the source/destination address tables as described by Lau are not suitable to be used as routing tables, because they do not include information needed for routing, such as an output link number.

Even when additionally considering the teachings of Kuhn, there would have been no reason to include information such as an output link number into the source/destination address tables as described by Lau. In fact, such information would not be useful in the devices as described by Lau, because these devices, i.e. the flow monitors, are not provided with output links to which data packets are switched. Among the interfaces of the flow monitors as described by Lau, none has the purpose of transmitting data packets. Therefore,

information such as an output link number would be totally useless in the source/destination address tables of Lau.

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that the teachings of Lau with respect to compressing the source/destination address table is incompatible with the teachings of Kuhn. Lau is directed to routing data packets without performing decompression and recompression whereas Kuhn concerns forwarding an IP packet immediately with the CID2 on the output link (see paragraph [0014]). In other words, while Lau proposes to use compression, the teachings of Kuhn aim at avoiding decompression and recompression by performing a search on the basis of the CID as transmitted together with the IP packet.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Lau and Kuhn does not arrive at the limitation “wherein each entry of the routing table comprises a compressed forwarding address and an output link number, and that, if a positive comparison between the compressed destination address identifier and a compressed forwarding address in an entry stored in the routing table is found, the data packet is switched to an output link associated with the output link number in the entry.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 18, 30, and 36 over Lau and Kuhn should be withdrawn.

### III. Dependent Claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37

Claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37 were each rejected as being obvious over Lau in view of Kuhn and in some cases an additional reference. Claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37 all depend from and incorporate all the limitations of claim 18, 30 or 36. Accordingly, it is respectfully

submitted that claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37 are also allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claims 18, 30 and 36 are allowable, as well as additional reasons. Therefore, the examiner's rejection of claims 20-29, 31-35 and 37 should be withdrawn.

#### IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

/David R. Moorman/  
Attorney for Applicants  
Attorney Registration No. 59,323  
Maginot Moore & Beck  
Chase Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109  
Telephone: (317) 638-2922